

**PRELIMINARY  
STAFF REPORT  
2004 AREA PLANS REVIEW**

**SUPERVISOR DISTRICT(S):** PROVIDENCE

**APR ITEM(S):**04-II-13TC

---

**NOMINATOR(S):** Martin D. Walsh

**ACREAGE:** 18.94 Acres

**TAX MAP I.D. NUMBERS:** 30-3((28))B4,1,2,7; part of 30-3((1))7B

**GENERAL LOCATION:** N of Magarity Rd., and W of Anderson Rd

**PLANNING AREA(S):** II

**District(s):** MCLEAN

**Sector:** TYSONS CORNER (M1)

**Special Area(s):** TYSONS CORNER URBAN CENTER (Sub-units S-2 & S-3)

**ADOPTED PLAN MAP:** 16-20 DU/AC, RETAIL & OTHER, PUBLIC FACILITIES

**ADOPTED PLAN TEXT:** **Sub-unit S-2:** Residential use up to 20 du/ac, except for the shopping center (Parcels 30-3((28))2 and 7), which is planned for office and neighborhood retail uses. Option: Redevelopment with residential use at 20-30 du/ac with conditions. Building Height: Multi-family use on Magarity Rd is limited to 45 ft; Shopping Center is limited to 40 ft.

**Sub-unit S-3:** Parcel 30-3((01))7B is planned for and developed with a public school.

For complete Plan text see <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/planareas.htm>  
<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/area2/tysons2.pdf>

**PROPOSED PLAN AMENDMENT:** Add option: Mixed use up to 2.0 FAR with 50% or more multi-family use (to include 200 elderly housing units), 10% to 20% retail and up to 30% office. Shopping center should be relocated to Magarity Rd as neighborhood retail use. Building height up to 150 ft in the northern portion transitioning down toward Anderson Rd. with height of 45 feet and Magarity Rd. with height of 35 ft.

**CRITICAL ISSUES:**

**Land Use:** Two critical issues are the nomination's intensity and compatibility with adjacent development in terms of scale and mass. The current Plan provides for redevelopment up to 30 du/ac (35 du/ac with ADU and bonus units or an intensity between 0.88 and 1.14 FAR). The nomination proposed a redevelopment with significantly more intensity (an intensity with ADU and

bonus units of between 1.51 and 1.97 FAR). See **Attachment 1: Land Use Quantification** for APR 04-II-13TC.

On portions of the subject property, the nomination proposes significant increases in building height, which raises compatibility concerns in terms of building mass and scale. The current Plan shows building heights for the subject property between 40 feet and 45 feet. Even though the nomination's clarification letter provides more specific height guidance by having six height zones that may provide a transition in height from adjacent low density areas along Magarity Road and Anderson Road; the nomination proposes substantial height increases on much of the subject property. For example, the northern corner shows heights at 150 feet, which is substantially greater than the 105 feet planned for the abutting West Gate office park.

**Transportation:** The nomination's daily trip generation is two to three times the current Plan's potential daily trips. See **Attachment 2: Transportation Comments**.

**Schools:** The nominator's proposed redevelopment has similar student enrollments to that of the current Plan's maximum residential use. See **Attachment 3: School Impacts**.

---

## SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_ **Approve Nomination as Submitted**  
\_\_\_ **X** \_\_\_ **Approve Staff Alternative**  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Retain Adopted Plan**

Staff recommends an alternative that allows consideration of relocating and expanding the shopping center and increasing the housing potential to include elderly housing in Tysons Corner.

The nomination's potential nonresidential development (3 to 8 times the existing nonresidential space) has notable transportation impacts at this edge of Tysons Corner. Staff supports a smaller neighborhood scale shopping center with up to 125,000 square feet (which is a 75% increase above the existing shopping center) and supports some ground floor retail in the residential redevelopment (up to 25,000 sq ft).

The nomination's proposed elderly housing component is consistent with the Plan objectives for increasing the diversity of the area's housing and generally consistent with the locational guidance for elderly housing. Staff supports the addition of elderly housing, which will add about 10 du/ac to the current Plan's 30 du/ac (or a total of 40 du/ac without ADU and bonus units). This additional development will have no more school impact than the current Plan and will have a relatively small traffic impact.

Staff supports moderate building height increases which will be compatible with the surrounding areas. Along Anderson Road and the shopping center relocation area, staff supports a maximum building height of 45 feet, except along Magarity Road, which should have a 25 feet building height limit and buffer area. The remaining area should be limited to 75 feet. See **Attachment 4: Staff's Preliminary Building Height Recommendation**.

This preliminary staff recommendation would yield between 850 and 900 units (including ADU and bonus units) and 150,000 sq ft of retail use. The intensity is between 1.2 and 1.6 FAR.

## Attachment 1: Land Use Quantification for APR 04-II-13TC

Staff quantified in **Table 1** the land use potential for the current Plan and the nomination for redevelopment. The current base Plan recognizes existing residential development of 246 units, which is about 20 du/ac, and recognizes the existing shopping center, which has 71,959 sq ft of retail space. The current Plan redevelopment option allows consideration of up to 30 du/ac with or without the redevelopment of the shopping center. Scenario 1 is the Plan's redevelopment potential when the shopping center is not redeveloped and Scenario 2 is the Plan's potential with the shopping center's redevelopment at 30 du/ac (35 du/ac with ADU and bonus units.)

Scenarios 3 and 4 represent the nomination's development potential, which yield intensities between 1.5 and 2.0 FAR. Both scenarios include 200 units for elderly housing units. Scenario 3 is the nomination's minimum housing potential and maximum nonresidential potential. Scenario 4 is the nomination's maximum housing potential and minimum nonresidential potential.

**Table1: Land Use Quantities**

	Residential				Nonresidential			Intensity
	Total Units	Elderly Units	Lo Rise MF Units	Md Rise MF Units	Total SQ FT	Retail SQ FT	Office SQ FT	FAR **
<b>Existing Development (Current Base Plan)</b>	246	0	246	0	71,959	71,959	0	0.47***
<b>Scenario 1: Current Plan's Minimum Redevelopment</b>	443*	0	0	443	71,959	71,959	0	0.62 to 0.79****
<b>Scenario 2: Current Plan's Maximum Redevelopment</b>	697*	0	0	697	35,000	35,000	0	0.88 to 1.14****
<b>Scenario 3: Nomination's Proposed Redevelopment (min residential with max nonresidential)</b>	814*	200	0	614	575,000	225,000	350,000	1.68 to 1.97****
<b>Scenario 4: Nomination's Proposed Redevelopment (max residential with min nonresidential)</b>	1019*	200	0	819	225,000	225,000	0	1.51 to 1.88****

\* Includes Affordable Dwelling Units and Bonus Units (17% more units than the Plan or nominated density).

\*\* FAR was calculated using the total nominated land area of 18.94 acres as provided in the Nomination's clarification letter.

\*\*\* The existing development FAR was calculated using the existing residential floor area of 313,125 sq ft as indicated in the Department of Tax Administration records and the shopping center floor area provided in the Nomination's clarification letter.

\*\*\*\* The intensities (FAR) for the current Plan and the Nomination's redevelopment scenarios were calculated by assuming variations in dwelling unit sizes (ranging from 1000 to 1300 sq ft per unit.).

## **Attachment 2: Transportation Comments**

The Department of Transportation offers the following comments regarding the subject Area Plan Review (APR) item.

- The proposed plan change raises significant transportation planning issues which should be addressed in the context of revised Plan text and/or maps, should this nomination be accepted. Any plan amendments resulting from this nomination should also be incorporated into the update of the Tysons Corner Urban Center Plan, expected to commence in early 2005.
- The subject property is located within 1/2 mile of the planned Tysons East Metro Station, which provides an opportunity to promote utilization of transit and reduced reliance on the single-occupant automobile for trip making. In order to maximize utilization of transit to/from the site, pedestrian improvements, parking ceilings, and implementation of transportation demand management (TDM) programs should be made a condition of development.
- A trip generation analysis of the proposed plan was prepared, based on land use and mix scenarios for the site developed by the Department of Planning & Zoning. The site is proposed to be redeveloped at an overall intensity between 1.5 - 2.0 FAR. The mix of uses varies, depending on the scenario, with residential remaining as the predominant use in all scenarios. With its proximity to a future rail station, a transit-oriented development was assumed that would incorporate pedestrian improvements and other design elements to promote transit utilization. On this basis, reductions in vehicle trip generation due to transit usage were estimated in each of the scenarios for the residential and office components of the development. Reductions were also estimated to account for retail pass-by trips. Results for the proposed plan options were compared to results for the two scenarios developed for buildout under the current plan. See **Table 1** below for the results of this analysis
- Based on the trip generation analysis, the proposed plan for the property would generate the need for a minimum of three access points to the site from adjacent roadways. At least two entrance/exits should be provided directly from Magarity Road. One or more accesses should be provided from Colshire Drive and/or Dartford Drive. Depending on the sizing of the retail component and specific types of retail uses contained within it, additional access may be needed.
- The nominated property is potentially affected by the planned improvement of Magarity Road to a full 4-lane divided facility. The property should provide sufficient right-of-way for this improvement.
- It should be noted that increases in residential units in the Tysons Corner Urban Center provide a number of benefits from a transportation standpoint: 1) Due to the heavy employment and retail base in Tysons, peak hour traffic flow is predominantly inbound in the morning, outbound in the evening. By providing greater levels of residential development in the urban center, more vehicle trips can be made outbound in the morning and inbound in the

evening, thus taking advantage of excess roadway capacity in the non-peak directions of travel; 2) Adding more residential to Tysons Corner also allows for more vehicle trips to remain within the urban center, thus reducing overall miles traveled to work and shopping; and 3) Adding more residential use to Tysons allows for more walk trips and other modes of non-motorized transportation to occur within the activity center, due to the better mix of uses, and facilitates more people to use public transportation, as rail transit is extended to the urban center, and beyond to Dulles airport.

- Roadway improvements needed due to redevelopment of the subject property, and specific traffic mitigation measures, should be addressed in the course of the normal rezoning review process. Should the proposed Plan amendment be adopted, development at these levels should be conditioned on submission of a detailed traffic impact study, in conjunction with a development application, that identifies all transportation improvements needed to mitigate traffic generated by the development.

**Table 1: Trip Generation Analysis for APR#04-II-13TC  
(Tysons Commons Area)**

<i>Scenario</i>	<i>AM</i>		<i>PM</i>		<i>Daily</i>
	<i>In</i>	<i>Out</i>	<i>In</i>	<i>Out</i>	
Current Plan Base (246 low rise apts., 72,000 s.f. retail)	85	105	275	235	5,100
Current Plan Option 1* (443 mid-rise apts., 72,000 s.f. retail)	100	105	280	250	5,980
Current Plan Option 2** (697 mid-rise apts., 35,000 s.f. retail)	75	115	210	175	5,045
Proposed Plan Option 3*** (614 mid-rise apts., 200 senior apts., 225,000 s.f. retail mix, and 335,000 s.f. office)	670	290	645	925	15,500
Proposed Plan Option 4**** (819 mid-rise apts., 200 senior apts., 225,000 s.f. retail mix)	245	260	595	545	12,885

\* *Minimum residential w/ affordable dwelling units and bonus units*

\*\* *Maximum residential w/ ADU's and bonus units*

\*\*\* *Minimum residential mixed use w/ ADU's and bonus units*

\*\*\*\* *Maximum residential mixed use w/ ADU's and bonus units*

**Table 1** shows that under the current plan, peak hour and daily trips remain relatively constant regardless of which scenario is selected. Option 1 produces the highest daily traffic, but all three current plan options generate between 5 - 6,000 daily trips. The proposed plan options generate sizable increases in both peak hour and daily trips, when assessed against the current plan

scenarios. Peak hour trips and daily traffic more than double over the current plan options. Proposed plan option 3, which adds 350,000 square feet of office use, generates the highest amounts of new traffic. In all the scenarios save current plan option 2, the retail component of the site generates by far the highest amount of new traffic, even after adjustments are made to account for pass-by trips. With the exception of current plan option 2, which has a modest 35,000 sq. ft. of retail, the retail component of the development accounts for the majority (between 60 - 75%) of the daily traffic generated in the current plan option and proposed plan scenarios.

### Attachment 3: School Impacts

The potential impacts on public schools are highlighted in three tables below. **Table 1** shows the schools serving the subject property, the enrollment capacity for each school and the 2004 student enrollment. The subject property's existing student enrollment numbers is included in the 2004 enrollment data. Currently, each school is operating under capacity.

**Table 1: 2004 Total Enrollment and Capacity**

School	Total School Capacity	2004 Total Enrollment*	2004 Capacity Status
Westgate Elementary	420	343	-77
Longfellow Middle	1115	1067	-48
McLean High	1725	1712	-13
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3260</b>	<b>3122</b>	<b>-138</b>

\*Includes the existing development of 246 MF units that generates approximately 56 students (34 elementary, 7 middle, 15 high).

**Table 2** shows the subject property's existing enrollment and estimated enrollment for the four redevelopment scenarios. The existing garden apartments generate about 56 total students. Scenario 1, which assumes redevelopment to mid-rise apartments, generates about 45 students. Scenario 1 is estimated to have 11 fewer students than existing development because mid-rise apartments have enrollment rates that are significantly lower than garden style apartments.

Scenario 2, which is the Plan's current maximum development, is projected to increase the subject properties enrollment by 15 students (most of which would be elementary school students). Scenarios 3 and 4 have similar projected enrollments to Scenario 2 because each of these scenarios has a high percent (20% to 25%) of elderly housing units.

**Table 2: Student Existing and Projected Enrollments for Subject Property**

Existing Enrollment		Projected Enrollment			
School	Existing Development (Current Base Plan)	Scenario 1: Current Plan Min Redevelopment	Scenario 2: Current Plan Max Redevelopment	Scenario 3: Nomination's Proposed Redevelopment (min residential w/ max nonresidential)	Scenario 4: Nomination's Proposed Redevelopment (max residential w/ min nonresidential)
Westgate Elementary	34	28 (-6)	44 (+10)	39 (+5)	52 (+18)
Longfellow Middle	7	5 (-2)	8 (+1)	7 (0)	9 (+2)
McLean High	15	12 (-3)	19 (+4)	17 (+2)	23 (+8)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>45 (-11)</b>	<b>71 (+15)</b>	<b>63 (+7)</b>	<b>84 (+28)</b>

\* Numbers in parentheses show the difference in student enrollment between each of the scenarios for redevelopment and the existing development.

**Table 3** shows each school's capacity, the projected enrollment for 2008/09 (without redevelopment of the subject property) and projected student enrollment for each redevelopment scenario. This table highlights that both the current Plan's redevelopment and the nomination's proposed redevelopment scenarios will result in enrollments above each school's capacity and that all have similar school capacity impacts.

**Table 3: Total Projected School Enrollment and Capacity**

School	Total School Capacity	2008/2009 Total Enrollment	Projected Total School Enrollment and Capacity			
			Scenario 1: Current Plan Min Redevelopment	Scenario 2: Current Plan Max Redevelopment	Scenario 3: Nomination's Proposed Redevelopment (min residential w/ max nonresidential)	Scenario 4: Nomination's Proposed Redevelopment (max residential w/ min nonresidential)
Westgate Elementary	420	434 (+14)	428 (+8)	444 (+24)	439 (+19)	452 (+32)
Longfellow Middle	1115	1165 (+50)	1163 (+48)	1166 (+51)	1165 (+50)	1167 (+52)
McLean High	1725	1895 (+170)	1892 (+167)	1899 (+174)	1897 (+172)	1903 (+178)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3260</b>	<b>3494 (+234)</b>	<b>3483 (+223)</b>	<b>3509 (+249)</b>	<b>3501 (+241)</b>	<b>3522 (+262)</b>

\* Numbers in parentheses show the number of students projected to be over school capacity.

**Attachment 4: Staff's Preliminary Building Height Recommendation**

